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ABSTRACT: Liberating Education is the starting point for overcoming sectarianism, which arises from an uncritical reading of the world based on extremist ideologies. The article discusses the relationship between Liberating Education and ideologies, asking about the role of education in this process of humanization of the human being. The paper aims to establish a relationship between Liberating Education and overcoming ideological sectarianism, emphasizing that this overcoming only occurs through dialogue. The path taken is a hermeneutic reading of some books by Paulo Freire that revolve around the Pedagogy of the Oppressed. In the conceptualization of ideology, Freire is put in contact with the thought of Paul Ricoeur. The paper concludes that the role of the school is not to break sectarianism, but to help human beings to do so.
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RESUMO: A Educação Libertadora é o ponto de partida para a superação do sectarismo, que surge de uma leitura acrítica do mundo baseada em ideologias extremistas. O artigo discute a relação entre Educação Libertadora e ideologias, perguntando qual o papel da educação nesse processo de humanização do ser humano. O objetivo é estabelecer uma relação entre Educação Libertadora e superação do sectarismo ideológico, destacando que essa superação só se dá através do diálogo. O caminho percorrido é uma leitura hermenêutica de alguns livros de Paulo Freire que discutem a Pedagogia do Oprimido. Na conceituação de ideologia, Freire é colocado em contato com o pensamento de Paul Ricoeur. O artigo conclui que o papel da escola não é romper com o sectarismo, mas ajudar o ser humano a fazê-lo.
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RESUMEN: La Educación Liberadora es el punto de partida para superar el sectarismo, que surge de una lectura no crítica del mundo basada en ideologías extremistas. El artículo discute la relación entre la Educación Liberadora y las ideologías, preguntando cuál es el papel de la educación en este proceso de humanización del ser humano. El objetivo es establecer una relación entre la Educación Liberadora y la superación del sectarismo ideológico, enfatizando que esta superación solo ocurre a través del diálogo. El camino tomado es una lectura hermenéutica de algunos libros de Paulo Freire que giran en torno a la Pedagogía de los Oprimidos. En la conceptualización de la ideología, Freire es puesto en contacto con el pensamiento de Paul Ricoeur. El artículo concluye que el papel de la escuela no es romper el sectarismo, sino ayudar a los seres humanos a hacerlo.
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Introduction

The celebration of the centenary of Paulo Freire's birth in 2021 brought a diversity of reflections on the current and updating of his thinking. In this article, we discuss the role of liberating education and the overcoming of sectarianism, which, in turn, potentiate an ideological reading of the world.

Ideological or ideological thinking reached Freire himself. The patron of Brazilian education is accused of sectarianism and political-ideological indoctrination. Ideologies that adopt a linear worldview do not perceive in Freire's subversion the possibility of overcoming this very linearity of thought that prevents them from making one the decoding of reality; on the contrary, they see it as an affront, and this makes them even dangerous, because they are aggressive.

The different understandings about the world, which respond to the longings of part of humanity, gain ideological contours when they ignore historical facts and cling to fragile and superficial hermeneutics. This is a basic problem of this article, which discusses the action of education on ideologies in Paulo Freire's thought, having as its starting point the dimension of unfinished of the human being (FREIRE, 2003a; 2003b). Here we defend the idea that ideologies are important in the formation of social thought, and develop in society from human frailties. Attachment to ideologies is the result of the search for immediate answers to questions related to these weaknesses.

In developing this idea, the article asks: what kind of action does liberating education have on the subject so that he can develop as a free individual, capable of understanding and questioning the ideologies that can lead him to situations of oppression? One of the issues to be addressed is the increasing individualization of the human being in contemporary society. This
individualized human being becomes fragile, for it is in the community that he finds the strength he needs to live. The ideologies that apparently respond to your anxieties and weaknesses help you to find, in the ideological community, the support you need as an individual to consolidate your position in the world.

Persistent political-ideological polarization in Brazil can be seen as a reflection of this situation. Every extremist tends not to realize that the world is made up of people who have diverse thinking. Therefore, it is not possible to dialogue with the different, because it does not recognize as reality what can question the narrative itself; and, if it does not recognize the different as real, it does not find reasons to dialogue with it.

Based on this assumption, the article wants to highlight the importance of liberating education as a way out of this reality. While much of the polarized ideological world has placed in Paulo Freire and the Pedagogy of the Oppressed the blame for the frequent low results of Brazilian education and even for the political polarization itself and the so-called "left transformation" of education, Freire wants just the opposite: overcoming all sectarianism, right or left (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 26; 2013, p. 118).

The understanding of the human being is a being under construction – and therefore inconclusive, fragmented – places in education the role of joining the pieces and humanizing it (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 30), because the dehumanized human being, which is represented not only by those "who have their humanity stolen, but also, even if differently, in those who steal it" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 30, our translation), is a distortion of what it is to be human. Both, those who steal humanity and those who have humanity stolen, need to be aware, by praxis, of their fragility as human beings and of their dehumanization. It's not just rational consciousness, it's praxis awareness.

Historically, this is revealed when the oppressed, in addition to not realizing that they are, still defend their oppressors and blindly obey their wills, without realizing that they are being robbed in their dignity. And if you do, you don't have the capacity or the strength to fight it. It is not a rational or intellectual problem, but inability to relate events with one's own life and is again with events, in a hermeneutic circle. On the other hand, it is also possible that the one who oppresses is not aware of being oppressive. There is a tendency of imbalance when the oppressed assume power or some kind of power; this, if he has not developed the consciousness of praxis, tends to become oppressor, to show society who is in charge. And often oppresses their own fellowmen, those who until recently were in the same fight.

This article, in the form of an essay, makes a hermeneutic analysis of Freirean's thought that refers to the question of ideologies and the incompletes of the being, relating the two ideas
and demonstrating that the role of liberating education is not only to develop class consciousness in the human being or to lead him to understand his role in the world, because these two functions, when not carried out satisfactorily, can strengthen a sectarian ideology. Liberating education wants the construction of the human being, contributing to him being increasingly integrated and aware that neither he, nor his ideas, nor the ideas that make up the world are ready. That everything can be questioned, including the ideas themselves. And that by questioning them he does not weaken; on the contrary, it strengthens.

The hermeneutic analysis of ideologies places, in this article, Freire’s (2003b) thought in relation to Ricoeur’s (1990). Although both are of different epistemological aspects, it is possible to find similarity with regard to the concept of ideology; moreover, it is possible to draw a parallel between Ricoeur’s and Freire's thinking in the relationship of the human being with the ideological issue and in the possibility of overcoming sectarianism.

For Freire, the awareness, when it occurs through praxis, is able to lead the individual to realize that what he sees does not necessarily need to be seen in the same way; whereas reality is wider than what the eyes see and the brain captures; that the world is composed of more elements than those that the subject knows. But praxis only exists from life, because true learning is built through experiences.

**About the unfinished aspect of the human being**

Freire's thought is deeply human. However, one cannot look at Freire's work only under the bias of humanism; that would be a dangerous and reductionist look. His thinking is also deeply political, as is Latin American thought from the late 1950s from the last century to the early 1990s. It is not possible to separate, in Freire, the politician from the teacher, and to understand this is important to understand his pedagogy of the human being.

As an educator, Freire discovered that he was all the more a teacher the more he was able to learn. This dialectic became the basis of the Pedagogy of the Oppressed. He positioned himself as a teacher-learner, showing that the one who believes himself ready, graduated, because he holds a diploma, is not able to help the student to confront the world, because he himself, a trained subject, is not able to make this confrontation. Perhaps because he faced poverty and hunger in childhood, as he himself narrates in "Cartas a Cristina" (FREIRE, 2013), he has the authority to talk about it. This narrative is reinforced by the following statement: "I have never felt inclined [...] to think that life was like this, that the best thing to do in the face
of obstacles would be to simply accept them as they were" (FREIRE, 2013, p. 41, our translation).

The development of personal autonomy in the face of the world, to knowledge, occurs when one realizes that he can dialogue with reality. One of the conditions to be a teacher is: "Teaching requires awareness of the unfinished" (FREIRE, 2003a, p. 50). The idea that the human being who is in formation is an unfinished being does not seem to be so obvious. Therefore, the insistence on the need for consciousness, because "the incomplete of the being or its inconclusion is proper to the vital experience" (FREIRE, 2003a, p. 51, our translation). However, it points to an important question:

I like to be people because, unfinished, I know I'm a conditioned being, but, conscious of the unfinish, I know I can go beyond it. This is the profound difference between being conditioned and being determined. The difference between the unfinished that is not known as such and the unfinished that historic and socially reached the possibility of unfinished knowledge (FREIRE, 2003a, p. 53, our translation).

The incomplete of the human being is opposed to the non-obviated the awareness of being unfinished. And education is necessary precisely because of this non-consciousness. To be a subject of history itself, one must realize that the formative itinerary follows throughout life. On the other hand, no one can teach what they do not know, and so to be a teacher is necessary this awareness.

In order to be a subject of history itself and to be able to dialogue with reality, with the world and with knowledge, the attitude of humility towards the condition of incompleteness is fundamental. For Freire, it's one thing to be; another thing is to be-in-process, or what he calls "being" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 73). "To be has to being." (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 73). Life is a process in which "men educate each other, mediated by the world" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 68, our translation).

"Being" is a human condition. Every learning process only happens because, at some point, we realize that we are not self-reliant and are not ready to face the world. By saying that "there is no me to constitute without a non-I" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 71, author's emphasis, our translation), Freire affirms the importance of understanding that, in the formation of the person, there is something that has not yet been added to his identity, and this until the end of life. This something like this is defined: "In turn, the non-I constituent of the I is constituted in the constitution of the constituted I" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 71, author's emphasis, our translation).

Between the non-me and the being there’s a bridge. Non-I is not the denial of the self as what does not exist, but refers to what does not yet exist in the self. There's an important
difference in this relationship. If there is no denial of the self, it means that it exists in potency, that is, what it is not can be. The Heraclitan idea explains here the idea that not only things are always changing, but so are people. Hence the importance of the bridge between the non-me and the being, because it means that the process of change is happening in the person.

The ipseity that results from this being in the world demonstrates that the construction of being is individual and different for each one. In each subject there are elements of identity that remain the same, and elements that change. The construction of being, or the relationship between the non-me and being is only possible because of the recognition of the need for change. Freire states that the process of duration of education – which is constantly redone – "is on the axis of the contrary permanence-change" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 73, our translation).

The role of education in the continuous process of construction-reconstruction is clearer here. And liberating education is able to realize that all the subjects involved in this process are protagonists in the construction of the world. Banking education doesn't realize that. For banking education, the teacher is the trained subject who fills the empty head of the student until that small part of the knowledge that belongs to this student is deposited in it. And bank education is based on permanence, while liberating education is based on change.

The dialectic permanence-change, proper to education and knowledge acquired in the world, is present in the human being as a tension between opposites. On the one hand, there is the desire to remain, because it does not cause anything. Staying is easier because it maintains a good safety index. On the other hand, there is the need (and even the desire) for change. However, the desire for change is provocative and uninstall. It demands awareness of human frailty, for the human being is fragile because it is unfinished, and when he is aware that it is unfinished, he desires change. Here, by the way, there may be another tension, between the fragile and the strong. If on the one hand the unfinished can be fragile, on the other precisely because it is under construction it is strong.

Human history carries these dialectical tensions, which are healthy. To think of the human being as unfinished is to give voice to their history. The recognition that history is also being constructed and that each event is the result of past events helps to understand why the human being also has change as a characteristic trait of his identity. In this case, change is not opposed to permanence, but both complement each other to form the human being who is, at the same time, being and being.

In human inconclusion, the most varied possibilities are designed. As long as being-in-process, growth and change are always present in power. However, for this growth, this change, it is necessary that the subject discovers a person. And the way to do that is an education that
shows you this process of personal growth. At the same time, it is necessary that he knows and lives his own story, and for this narrative is an element of fundamental importance.

*Ipseity* represents, therefore, the power of change in the same way that the incompleteness of the human being represents for Freire the possibility of the human being built every day, as a work of art (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 199); for Freire, the task of educating is artistic because construction, and art is construction and reconstruction.

Not all education allows the desired interaction with knowledge so that there is, in fact, learning. Education alone does not change anyone, and this makes ideological the idea that for there to be social transformation, schools are enough. For change to cease to exist in power and actually come into existence, it is necessary that education frees humans from their condition as a slave to reality and facts.

**Decency and beauty together": the beauty of the subject's construction**

Another condition for education is the union of ethics with aesthetics (FREIRE, 2003a, p. 32). Stating that both must be "holding hands" – not just walking together – Freire states that they are interdependent. This interdependence means that one serves to build the other.

In his genius production, Guimarães Rosa (2001, p. 326, our translation) put this idea in the mouth of his character Riobaldo, saying that "Master is not who always teaches, but who suddenly learns". What makes the teacher a teacher-learner is precisely the openness to learning and the understanding that, as much as he knows, there will always be something new, and that the student who started the year is not the same one who finishes the semester. Paulo Freire's posture as an educator was precisely this: that of teacher-apprentice, with a knowledge shaped by praxis.

Aesthetics says a lot about human education. When developing the ideal of aesthetics in education, Freire refers especially to the process of construction of the work of art, which makes the raw material into something beautiful. The aesthetic for Freire is not only the work of art ready, but the beauty present in the process, as can be seen from the following quotation:

> Although the task of training and shaping students is not strictly the educator's, whatever the level of education, in my way of understanding, I am an assistant to the students in the process of their formation, of their growth. But this process is necessarily an artistic process. It is impossible to participate in this modeling process, which is like a new birth, without some aesthetic moments. In this respect, education is necessarily an aesthetic exercise (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 199, our translation).
Education as an aesthetic process is reflected in the beauty of the subject's construction. In this sense, Freirean notion of being presents itself as a little more than the construction of one's life. The construction of one another, as being in the world, is a process, if not collective, at least of co-participation: "men educate themselves" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 68).

That is why the human being does not develop as such unless in society. The formative process of one another demands it. The aesthetic beauty of this process lies in the fact that by being agents of each other's formation, or educating each other, in the same way that the artist leaves a little of himself in the work of art he produces, each one leaves a little of himself in the other; therefore, teacher and student are not two parts of a vertical formation process. On the contrary, teacher and student participate in the process of building each other: "educator-educating with educating-educator" (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 68, our translation).

This proposal of an aesthetic education is very expensive for Freire. Being aesthetic is a fundamental characteristic of education. Being aesthetic is the identity of education, when it allows the subject to find his place in the world. The process of formation of the subject is, per se, beautiful, because it is construction, and as such, it is transformation:

Another point that makes education an artistic moment is exactly when it is also an act of knowledge. To know, for me, is something beautiful! To the extent that knowing is unveiling an object, unveiling gives "life" to the object, calls it to "life", and even gives it a new "life". This is an artistic task, because our knowledge has the quality of giving life, creating and animating objects while studying (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 199, our translation).

It is not only training that is aesthetic, but knowledge itself. Knowing is beautiful because at the same time unveils the identity of the known object and promotes changes in the cognoscenti subject. To know is to discover, to discover, to promote exchanges with the unveiled object. When the subject begins to relate to the known object, the history of both begins to have elements in common. This also applies to the knowledge of history itself: "Making memories is a bit recreating what has been done" (FREIRE; GUIMARÃES, 2011, p. 32, our translation).

According to Freire, the relationship with knowledge must be of curiosity (2003a, p. 29). Curiosity leads to discovery and the desire to know more. You know who asks, you ask who's curious. The challenge of learning is the greater the greater the possibility of reflection on the object. Curiosity is what arouses to the question, and without question there is no research or questioning. And without questioning there is no change, which is the core of Freirean pedagogy: "A stone object, which man one day realizes that he can cut wood, becomes an axe" (FREIRE; GUIMARÃES, 2011, p. 27, our translation).
The aesthetic dimension of education is much more focused on this process of realizing, because it is it that causes change. This dimension is not isolated from liberating education itself, as a characteristic apart. Liberating education is necessarily aesthetic and ethical, precisely because it awakens to question and questioning and these will provoke change. And the aesthetics of education is not the change that happened, but happening. It's not what it was, it's being. It's a subtle difference, but important. A relationship of continuity. The combination of aesthetics with ethics.

The net dimension of the world presented by Bauman (2001) implicitly brings this idea of continuity. The liquid, when it dwells, only for when it encounters a barrier or when it loses its strength. Similarly, it is considered that things are in continuous motion. The same is the case with ideas. It is assumed that they must always be on the move, developing until they find a barrier or no longer have enough strength to evolve. Freire's subversive thinking wants ideas to overcome these barriers and gain strength as they are grown. And they are constantly gnawed, like a river that receives new waters, gaining new life at every turn.

Aesthetic education, which is "an artistic moment" (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 199), transforms the formation of the subject into a formative itinerary, which causes the relationship of continuity to extend throughout life. The same thing happens in the world of ideas. The understanding that there are, and cannot be, ready and finished ideas is fundamental in the process of construction of the human being, because human praxis is based on the ideas that constitute society. When they are seen as finished, praxis – the basis of the pedagogy of liberation – loses its meaning, because there is nothing to reflect on finished ideas.

The beauty of education is the fact that it allows the subject to understand and position himself/herself in the world. And that doesn't mean this guy should resignify himself. It is dialogue, Freire says, that makes it possible for this to happen. "Dialogue is the joint confirmation of teachers and students in the common act of knowing and recognizing the object of study" (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 170, our translation). For Freire, "dialogical education is an epistemological posture" (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 170, our translation) and not a bizarre invention of the third world.

Dialogue is thus a form of knowledge that refers once again to communion, which is a condition for liberating education to take place. Contrary to the internationalized banking education, which transmits ready-made knowledge and, therefore, does not allow dialogue, in liberating education dialogue is a sine qua non condition for the development of the person. Thus, the aesthetics of education becomes something that not only thinks about the subject, but also, and especially the community.
Here lies the fusion of aesthetics and ethics: not only in the beauty of the process of formation of the individual, but in, together with the individual, thinking about the community, in a return to the premise, which is the starting point of liberating education, that people educate themselves in communion. For Freire, this epistemological perspective of education is based on the idea that all knowledge, when it becomes old, should make room for a new one (FREIRE; SHOR, 2011, p. 173). And knowledge has no shelf life: when another one emerges that can supplant it, the old one is old. But it should not be thrown away: both the old and the new must continue to dialogue, because otherwise there is the risk of plunging into a sectarian ideology.

**About education and ideology**

For Freire, education is ideological (2003a, p. 135). This means that all education takes a position, both banking and liberating. There is no possibility of a neutral education, because even if it focuses on transmitting only curricular knowledge, it will be assuming a well-defined position. Recognizing this is fundamental to understand that there is no education: there are educations.

This was perhaps the most controversial point of Freirean pedagogical thought at all times, not because the idea is, in itself, controversial, but because different ideologies are reluctant to accept the fact that education is ideological. The most impacted factor here is, more than the idea that education can be ideological, that it is necessarily ideological.

To assume that education is ideological is to assume that it can question all ideologies, including the dominant one. And education will only be liberating when the subject acquires sufficient autonomy to question the very ideology assumed by the educational model with which he lives. That's the opposite of indoctrination. When an ideology is assumed as a kind of sect by a group, it is indoctrinating and does not allow questioning. But liberating education is essentially questionable and does not allow indoctrination.

Although this attitude is also ideological, it puts the subject in contact with other possibilities and even grants him the right to position himself against the school itself, because it is precisely the ability to question that makes him autonomous.

Living and dialoguing with history itself and with the world is fundamental for the autonomous subject. Not just disagree or agree, but question, always. The attitude of the questioner is that of the free human being before the world and of history itself.

For Ricoeur (1990, p. 63, our translation), ideologies are acquired ideas that are assumed to be true; in general, ideology does not admit contestation, and each group firmly believes that
the other group is ideological, but it does not. These groups are, in Freire's saying (2003b, p. 25), sectarian, because they do not admit dialogue. On the contrary, those who manage to free themselves from this sectarian thought remain ideological, but know how to dialogue with their own ideology.

Thus, ideologies, when they have sectarianism as identity, assume a function of domination. If, on the one hand, they appear as a more pleasant alternative than reality, on the other hand, because they deny reality, they are necessarily castrating. "The fear of freedom, of which its bearer is not necessarily aware, makes him see what does not exist", says Freire (2003b, p. 24). We can add: see what does not exist and not see what exists.

Refuge in ideologies is often based on fear of reality or history itself. No matter what the political position of the subject:

This is the reason, for example, why the right-wing sectarian [...] intends to slow down the process, 'domesticate' time and thus men. This is also the reason why the left-wing man, by sectarianizing himself, is totally wrong in his 'dialectical' interpretation of reality, of history, letting himself fall into fundamentally fatalistic positions. (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 26, our translation).

Perhaps one of the most forceful accusations Freire has faced in Brazil in recent years has been sectarianism and ideological manipulation or indoctrination. This citation, however, shows the difference pointed out by him between sectarianizing and questioning. The subject, no matter what his political position, assumes an idea as ready, never an idea under construction. The danger of this behavior is precisely the fact that it remains attached to preconceived ideas, and does not allow the possibility of a different understanding.

To Freire (2003b), this attachment to preconceived ideas is part of fear. Now, fear, in fact, leads people to seek as a refuge a safe place, even if, somehow, they know that this safe place is not the best. It is important to mention that knowing is not the same thing as being aware of. Consciousness only develops when this knowledge is internalized.

Thus, the various ideologies that make up the status of society come into contact with each other, but do not dialogue. According to Freire (2003a; 2003b), they are necessarily present in the formation of society. The sectarian subject cannot perceive his own thought as ideological. That is why it becomes more difficult to overcome sectarianism. This, in Freire's view, is part of ideas preconceived and considered ready and that play the opposite role to that of liberation; in this case, it doesn't matter what ideology or the vision of society it defends. She will always be dominating and will try to impose herself at any cost on the others. And this becomes dangerous, because in such cases ideologies are placed above even human rights.
Ricoeur (1990, p. 157) discusses two types of ideologies that exemplify well what has been mentioned so far. One is the "ideology of peace at all price" (RICOEUR, 1990, p. 157, author's emphasis, our translation). Coming from the Christian thought that one must always love, she defends the idea that all things are resolved without conflict, and fights any revolutionary attempt to rescue human dignity. The other is the "ideology of conflict at all price" (RICOEUR, 1990, p. 162, author's emphasis, our translation). This ideology, obviously the opposite of the first, is part of the idea that one can only conquer something through conflict, be it an armed conflict or ideas.

In the Brazilian reality, it is perceived that both can and are used by people on the right or left, because they are, in addition to an ideology, a way of relating to the world of ideas. Although opposed, they fit the profile of sectarianism, since they assume a posture of social imposition and refusal to dialogue. Therefore, it becomes clear that the social function of domination or oppression can be assumed by any ideological group; the same can be said of the social function of liberation. Education itself can be - and often is - sectarian.

Freire differentiates radicalization from radicalization (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 27), considering the latter as the attitude of the revolutionary. Therefore, his assertion that the Pedagogy of the Oppressed should not be read by sectarian people is understandable. Based on the assumption that his ideology is the best, the sectarian cannot perceive the possibility of liberating this ideology, simply because he does not perceive this need. For Freire (2003b, p. 54), human beings only liberate themselves in communion, and sectarianism is not communion, because it does not admit dialogue.

It is a dilemma in the pedagogy of the oppressed: if on the one hand it has the function of freeing the subject from lack of consciousness, if he does not acquire this consciousness, he does not free himself. Thus, it is also ideological to affirm that education is the solution to the problem of sectarianism in society. The subject only frees himself when he makes the process of assuming himself subject of his own formation. Otherwise, he remains either attached to the same ideas or accommodated in the face of reality.

**Pedagogy of liberation: towards overcoming ideologies?**

Usually ideologies, when sectarian, impose themselves on ideas, even the most sensible, most often by force. Arguments and reasoned have no power to overcome the most basic of ideologies, because, as already stated, the sectarian does not have (or for fear does not want to
assume) the awareness of his sectarianism. Therefore, also for fear of the contrary argument, it is imposed by force.

This is a very common dynamic in society, and is not specific to any social class or linked to academic training. For the individual to become a blind defender of an ideology, it is necessary, in an apparent contradiction, that he is not aware that his ideology is an ideology. On the contrary, in the way that it is no longer sectarian, it is necessary that the individual acquires awareness of his sectarianism.

Ideologies, like religions, are communal, because to survive they need adherents. Like most religions, ideologies proselytize to increase the number of adherents. Ideologies feed on ideas, that is, they devour them in order to expand their field of action. This means that for sectarian ideologies, the less critical thinking, the more they develop and, therefore, they need to fight it and even annihilate it.

From this perspective, the solution seems to be the destruction of ideologies. The awareness, proper to those who went through the process of liberation, would in itself be sufficient to overcome them. For Freire (2003b, p. 30), this is "the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed – to free one another and the oppressors". This is also the great vocation of the Pedagogy of the Oppressed.

According to Freire (2003b, p. 32, our translation):

> Who, better than the oppressed, will find themselves prepared to understand the terrible meaning of an oppressive society? Who will feel, better than them, the effects of oppression? Who, more than them, to go understanding the need for liberation? Liberation to which they will not arrive by chance, but by the praxis of the search; recognition and the need to fight for it.

The role of liberating education is to lead the oppressed to realize their situation of oppressed and help the oppressor to realize their oppressive situation so that they can change their own position in the face of the world. However, here one cannot neglect the maxim that no one educates anyone. The proposal of liberating education is not to change people, because then it would be, itself, ideological and, why not, sectarian.

The great danger of ideology, according to Freire (2003a, p. 125, our translation) is that it "has to do directly with the concealment of the truth of facts, with the use of language to hide or veil reality, while making us 'short-sighted'".

It is the same danger shown by Ricoeur (1990, p. 82, our translation) when pointing out the risk of "blindness to the real" when an ideology becomes dogma – in this case, taking Marxist doctrine as an example, Ricoeur says that when it is dogmatized, "it prevents from
seeing with a new look the new social stratifications of advanced industrial societies or class formations [...] socialist societies."

Ricoeur (1990, p. 150, our translation) says that "surprises him, as a teacher and as an educator: the absence of a collective project in our societies". The author states this in the context of ideologies that affect especially overdeveloped countries that no longer have much more to fight for as a country project. Underdeveloped countries have the project to match the advanced countries; already the developed struggle to maintain the status, often trampling rules. For Freire, maintaining the status quo is an ideological issue that is difficult to overcome. In a situation where oppressors lose or are threatened with losing that status (oppressor status),

[...] yesterday's oppressors do not recognize themselves in liberation. On the contrary, they will feel like they are really being oppressed. It is that, for them, "formed" in the experience of oppressors, anything other than their old right to oppress means oppression for them. They will now feel in the new situation, as oppressed, because if they could rather eat, dress, put on, educate themselves, walk around, listen to Beethoven, any restriction on all this, in the name of everyone's right, it seems to them a profound violence to their right as a person. [...] It's just that, for them, human person is just them (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 44-45, our translation).

This dialectical, Hegelian relationship shows that without the oppressed, oppressors do not exist. For this very moment, the extreme need to maintain this status, which often results in violence, when the oppressed, who begin to become aware of their own status, begin to realize that they are, every day, raped and begin to claim their place in society and their right to life, no longer to survival.

The role of the pedagogy of the oppressed is to awaken to this consciousness, both of the oppressed and of the oppressors. The awareness that everyone has the same right to life. The oppressed have the right to fight for it, and oppressors have a duty to recognize this right, to recognize that their oppressor position prevents others from being people. It is a dehumanized and dehumanizing ideological position.

The pedagogy of the oppressed acts on the fragmentation of the subject who does not allow him to see anything beyond his own ideology. As previously mentioned, the more fragile, fragmented the subject, the more difficult it is that he understands this situation of fragmentation and fragility and easier to let his life be driven by an ideology. It is the role of education to lead you to overcome your fragile condition and take over the conduct of your own life, realizing what your place in the world is and fighting for your right to take this place.

In addition, it is the role of the pedagogy of the oppressed to help the subject to perceive that ideological discourse is flawed, "threatens to anesthetize the mind, to confuse curiosity, to
distort the perception of facts, things, events” (FREIRE, 2003a, p. 132, the author's griffins, our tra). By acquiring this perception, the subject tends to realize that this discourse presents a response to his frailties, his fears, his fragmentation as a human being, but does not help to develop a life project aimed at the collective. On the contrary, by clinging to ready, preconceived, distorted ideas, ideologies do not allow the human being to develop, because he does not enter into dialogue with the world and, therefore, does not perceive himself as a person in construction; and if by chance he has this consciousness, associated with being oppressed, he does not realize that the world is not like that.

This, however, in no way means that liberating education aims to overcome ideologies as an annulment of them. For Ricoeur (1990) and Freire (2003a), the very idea of a society that has no ideologies is ideological. "[...] it is illusory to believe that men will agree on a global project" (RICOEUR, 1990, p. 159, our translation). "In fact, i can only ideologically kill ideologies, but it is possible that I do not realize the ideological nature of the discourse that speaks of his death" (FREIRE, 2003a, p. 132, our translation).

Ideological discourse, therefore, is part of the constitution of society and it is not possible to imagine a world of ideas without it. However, one cannot imagine a world in which people do not dialogue with ideologies either. Overcoming ideologies does not mean denying them, but recognizing that they exist, recognizing that we all think ideologically and that it is so because we are in the world, we are not in the world and that, therefore, we are in the process of building ourselves to the end of our day; and that the same goes for ideas, any ideas.

**Final considerations**

The possibility of liberated ideologies does not have as its starting point, then, the annulment of these, but the recognition that they exist and that it is possible to establish a dialogue with them, if not through ideas, through praxis. This leads to thinking this possibility of liberation from the recognition of being-being.

That's because this recognition leads to action. In Freire's understanding, reflection without action is not enough to overcome dependence and become autonomous, because recognizing oneself oppressed "does not mean still fighting for overcoming the contradiction" which is this dependence on the oppressed in relation to the oppressor (FREIRE, 2003b, p. 33, our translation).

The role of education in this process is vital, and must begin with the humility of recognizing itself, too, incomplete and fragile. This is precisely what gives it the aesthetic
beauty of allowing yourself to change. And the dialectical question of frailty and fortitude, already presented by Paul in the Second Letter to the Corinthians (2 Cor 12:10) is repeated here: it is precisely in this fragility of being incomplete, inconclusive, that his strength lies.

Education will only recognize itself ideologically when one perceives itself incomplete. When it is delivered to the student as a ready package, neither it allows itself to make room for change, nor does it allow the student to do so. The cycle of the formative itinerary is repeated: the teacher learns from the student and vice versa; but at the same time, both transform the formation process itself.

The beauty of this formative cycle lies in the fact that the recognition of never being ready opens an infinite possibility of search, curiosity, and especially of question, of questioning. Not just ask "what I'm going to learn today", but "what's happening in the world today" and "how I'm going to position myself in the world today." When the school can ask these questions, so will the teacher and student, and they are the key to breaking the sectarianism of prefabricated ideologies.

Breaking with sectarianism is not the role of the school: it is the role of the subject who learns, at school, to live in an unsettled community. The school's role is to provoke, ask, question, because with the school the student learns to provoke, ask and question. Sectarian is the one who does not ask and accepts what is imposed on him by ideologies.

This work argues that the more fragile the human being, the more he needs ideologies to hold his belief in the world firmly, because breaking dogmatism brings insecurity, and the fragmented human being cannot live with insecurity. Education, when liberating, does not free him from insecurity, but helps him face the world in spite of them. It does not eliminate ideologies, but it helps the human being to humanize himself, even in the midst of an ideological world.

If it is not possible to dialogue with sectarianism, with dogmatism, it is possible to dialogue with the world, with others, with ideas. Until the individual reaches that conclusion, their learning process does not begin. Praxis is essentially dialogue with the world. Dialogue towards exchange.

The relevance of Freirean thought with regard to the liberation of the subject from sectarianism, from the ideologies that blind or make the subject myopic, becomes evident from the ideas expressed in this article. The entire construction of Freire's pedagogical ideas was guided by praxis, not having a diploma of Pedagogy himself. His learning was due to the contestation of conformism, the questioning of the world and the letting himself be questioned by people, as he himself reports in the Pedagogy of Hope (FREIRE, 1997).
Any conclusion, in the closing guise, to be come with this work would be to deposition against their own ideas. This article opens the way for more and more to investigate the role of education in overcoming ideological sectarianism. This is a theme that will not be exhausted or exhausted in the future, because education, if it is not banking, is a world of possibilities, with which one can always dialogue.
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